cf 1005

3

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

Writ petition No. 3582 2002

Petitioner - Deodhar Verma, aged about 22 years,
S/o late Shri Dindayal Verma,
R/o Village and Post - Selud
Distt. DURG (C.G.).

Versus.

Respondents - (1) Chairman,
Madhya Pradesh Electricity Board,
Shakti Bhawan,
Rampur, Jabalpur (M.P.)

(2) Chairman
Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board,
Danganiа - Raipur.

(3) Executive Engineer (Workshop) DN
Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board,
Bhilai-3, Distt. DURG.

through - Respondent No.2

P.R. No. 2539/02
Presented by Shri M.C. Mittal
Dated 19.11.02

NOTARY
Ashok Agrawal
DISTT. (ADVOCATES)
DURG
(C.G.) INDIA
STATE OF CHATTISGARH

PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS OR CERTIORARY OR PROHIBITION AND OR WRIT OF ANY OTHER NATURE NATURE AND/OR ORDER OR DIRECTION.

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

28

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक WP 2587/02 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

26-3-2004

Shri R. M. Pandey, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Bhaskar Pyasi, Panel Lawyer for respondent No.3.

Heard both the counsel.

The petitioner has preferred this writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India whereby the petitioner has prayed for directing the respondents to consider and appoint the petitioner on compassionate ground.

The petitioner's case is that his father was working under the respondent No.1 as Attendant Gr.-I and his father while serving under Superintendent Engineer (Workshop) Bhilai had expired on 13-11-99. On 17-12-99, the petitioner had submitted an application for appointment on compassionate ground. The said application was forwarded to Superintendent Engineer, Durg. The petitioner had contacted to various offices of respondent No.1 to know the status of his application. But, respondent No.1 kept the application of the petitioner pending without any reasonable ground.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that respondent No.2 has issued appointment orders in respect of 31 persons on compassionate ground. Counsel further submitted that the petitioner may be allowed to make a representation to respondents 1 & 2 and respondents 1 & 2 may be directed to decide the representation of the petitioner to which the learned counsel for respondent No.3 has no objection.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

29

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित —2—	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	allowed to make a detailed representation raising all his grievances to respondents 1&2 within a period of 10 days from today and in turn, respondents 1&2 will decide the representation of the petitioner within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of the representation considering all the grievances of the petitioner and will pass a reasoned order. In view of this order, I.A. No.9597/2003 stands disposed of. With the aforesaid directions, this writ petition is disposed of. Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order. Sd/- L.C.BHADOO Judge	

Barve/Sunita